

REMARKS

In the "Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment" (hereinafter "Notice") mailed on July 31, 2007, the Office indicated that the response to the Amendment mailed on July 18, 2007 (in response to Office Action mailed on March 21, 2007) was non-compliant with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.121 or 1.4 because the amendment to the Abstract was not presented on a separate sheet as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.72. Applicants note that there is absolutely no requirement in 37 C.F.R. 1.121 (which deal with the manner of making amendments) or 1.4 which require the amendments made to Abstract to be presented on a separate paper. 37 C.F.R. 1.72 (cited by the Office in the Notice) is part of the C.F.R. sections (1.71-1.79) dealing with application specification, not amendment formats, and therefore 37 C.F.R. 1.72 has no relevance to determining whether requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.121 are met. To the extent the Office may be referring to the statement in 37 C.F.R. 1.72(b) which indicates that "sheet or sheets presenting the abstract may not include other parts of the application or other material," this statement clearly refers to the presentation of the Abstract in the application specification, since the statement in question is immediately preceded by the statement that "abstract of the technical disclosure in the specification must commence on a separate sheet." Accordingly, for the above reasons, Applicants submit that the Notice should not have been issued, and the Amendment mailed on July 18, 2007 was in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121.

Notwithstanding the above, in order to obviate the issue raised in the Notice, Applicants are submitting herewith a revised **Amendments to the Specification**, as a part of which the amendment to the Abstract is presented separately on p. 3.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

 (R. No. 36,197)

Dated: December 12, 2007

By: JOHN LEE for Gerard Messina

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646